

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-44 are rejected. Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 are amended. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments made herein.

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview that was conducted regarding proposed claim amendments. The claim amendments made herein were conceived based on the discussions held during the interview. In addition, the Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the summary record of the interview that she agreed to provide.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schloss (U.S. Patent No. 5,878,233) in view of Jancke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,913). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that embodiments of the present invention as are recited in the Claims are neither shown nor suggested by Schloss in view of Jancke et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which sets forth that an embodiment of the present invention includes a method for user review and validation of content comprising the steps of:

...displaying said content; and displaying an indication of a state of a user's validation of said content, wherein said state of said user's validation of said content corresponds to:

content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation.

Independent Claims 12, 23 and 34 recite limitations similar to those found in Claim 1.

Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1, Claims 13-22 and 35-43 depend from Claim 12, Claims 24-33 depend from Claim 23 and Claim 44 depends from Claim 34. These Claims recite further features of the Claimed invention.

Schloss does not anticipate or render obvious a method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user's validation of the content where the state of the content corresponds to "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (and similar limitations of Claims 12, 23 and 34). Schloss only shows a system, method and computer program product for reviewing and creating advisories for data located in a content server. As such, Schloss is primarily concerned with the creation of advisories that characterize data only for data that resides in a content server. By contrast, the Applicants' invention as set forth in the Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 features user provided validations that not only characterize data ("positive validation", "negative validation" etc.) but also characterize the status of a users' review ("not reviewed", "reviewed") of the data. Moreover, the claims expressly set forth that the characterizations that are made are displayed for end user consumption. Nowhere in the Schloss reference is there taught or suggested a system or method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user's validation

of the content where the state of the validation of the content corresponds to “content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation” as is recited in Claim 1 (and similar limitations of Claims 12, 23 and 34). Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants’ invention as set forth in Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Schloss.

Jancke et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Schloss noted above. Jancke et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user’s validation of the content where the state of the content corresponds to either “content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation” as is recited in Claim 1 (and similar limitations of Claims 12, 23 and 34). Jancke et al. only shows a computer network status monitoring system. Jancke et al. is primarily concerned with monitoring the operational state of a plurality of nodes that are located in the network. By contrast, the Applicants’ invention as set forth in the Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 features validations (as noted above) that not only characterize data (“positive validation”, “negative validation” etc.) but also characterize the status of a users’ review (“not reviewed”, “reviewed”) of the data. Moreover, the claims expressly set forth that the characterizations that are made of the data and the status of a user’s review are displayed for end user consumption. Nowhere in the Jancke et al. reference is there taught or suggested a system or method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user’s validation of the content where the state of the user’s validation of the content corresponds to “content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation” as is recited in Claim 1 (and similar limitations of Claims 12, 23 and 34).

Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as set forth in Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Jancke et al. and Schloss either alone or in combination.

Accordingly, the Applicants also respectfully submit that Schloss and Jancke et al. either alone or in combination do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2-11 which depend from Claim 1, Claims 13-22 and 35-43 which depend from Claim 12, Claims 24-33 which depend from Claim 23 and Claim 44 which depends from Claim 34. Consequently, these Claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 4/26, 2004

Reginald A. Ratliff
Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060